DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 613 EA 028 007

AUTHOR Terry, Paul M.
TITLE The Principal and Instructional Leadership.
PUB DATE Aug 96
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors in Educational Administration (Corpus Christi, TX, August 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership; Interprofessional Relationship; *Leadership; *Leadership Responsibility; Leadership Styles; *Principals; School Administration; School Restructuring; School Supervision; Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

Effective-schools research has determined that successful schools are invariably led by a principal who is recognized as an instructional leader. This paper synthesizes and attempts to clarify the most recent perspectives on instructional leadership. Data sources included professional educational journals, trade books on leadership, and anthologies of articles written by professional educators. The paper defines instructional leadership and identifies the personal and professional characteristics of instructional leaders and the tasks in which they engage themselves and others. The paper also discusses strategies for implementing instructional leadership at the school site, the role of the central office in enhancing instructional leadership, the effects of effective instructional leadership on student achievement, and transformational leadership. The paper recommends restructuring the principal's role so that the principal focuses on performing administrative functions and delegates instructional/curricular responsibilities to a curriculum director who works with lead teachers. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 613

THE PRINCIPAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

by
Dr. Paul M. Terry
Indiana-Purdue University Fort Wayne

Presented at the

Annual Conference

National Council of Professors
of Educational Administration

August 7, 1996

Texas A & M - Corpus Christi

EA 028 007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Terry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

"The Principal and Instructional Leadership" is a research document that defines instructional leadership and itemizes some of the various components that experts in the field believe constitute good instructional leadership. The document also discusses strategies for implementing instructional leadership at the school site, the role of the central office in enhancing instructional leadership, and the impact effective instructional leadership can have on student achievement. Transformational leadership, a blend of managerial and instructional efforts designed to rethink and reform the public schools for the 21st century, is also addressed. The conclusion of the work makes recommendations for a rather traditional restructuring that represents a division of labors across both administrative and teaching levels in the hierarchy of schools. The purpose of preparing the document was to synthesize and clarify the most recent perspectives on instructional leadership. Resources used to gather, analyze, and synthesize data included professional journals in the field of education, tradebooks on leadership, both in the private and public sectors, and anthologies of articles written by professional educators.

Introduction

Effective schools research has determined that schools that succeed are invariably led by a principal who is recognized as an instructional leader. The purpose of this research is to identify those personal and professional characteristics that instructional leaders possess and the tasks they engage both themselves and others in. In addition, attention will be paid to the role of the central office in instructional leadership.

More recent points of view reflect the belief that the management responsibilities of the principal cannot be sacrificed on behalf of instructional leadership. Instead, school principals today must integrate those seemingly disparate tasks in a process coined transformational leadership. Transformational leadership, distinguished by its attention to situational leadership strategies dependent on contextual variables, allows principals to effectively function in environments that are besieged by constant change from all fronts. Indeed, the principal's role becomes one of transforming the public school in order to meet the demands of the 21st century. These demands cannot be met by instructional leadership alone. While instructional leadership moves the institution in the direction of academic success, which is the product of education, the institution, by virtue of being a tax supported public institution, requires a manager. This research, then, will also address the concept of transformational leadership and its role in the management of public schools.

The summation will suggest a reorganization of responsibilities and tasks in public schools. These recommendations will reflect the current trends of shared decision making and redistribution of responsibilities among a variety of shareholders in the process.

I. What is Instructional Leadership?

Perhaps the most difficult of tasks when studying the principal's role as instructional leader is to find an authoritative definition of the concept. Indeed, according to Greenfield this lack of definition has made it difficult to compare research findings on instructional leadership (1987). One might surmise from the vocabulary that it reflects exactly what it states: leadership in the domain of instruction.

The question is, what behaviors or actions constitute effective instructional leadership? Samuel Krug (1992) has set forth a five-factor taxonomy that encompasses all of the activities that an effective instructional leader should engage in:

Defining a Mission

Research on effective schools has shown that a clearly stated purpose that has been carefully communicated to all shareholders is a must. "The important role of the school's chief executive in explicitly framing school goals, purposes, and mission cannot be overestimated (p. 432)." A clear sense of purpose is especially important in times of structural change and/or crisis. Krug states, "Operating without a clear mission is like beginning a journey without having a destination in mind. Chances are you won't know when you get there (p. 432)."

Managing Curriculum and Instruction

"The primary service that schools offer is instruction (p.432)." Therefore, it is imperative that principals have at least an awareness of all subject areas and the special needs of each. A broad knowledge base that allows the principal to help others carry out the mission of the school is essential. They should be able to provide information and direction to teachers

regarding instructional methods, and they should be actively involved in and supportive of curriculum development.

Supervising Teaching

The supervisory role of the principal refers less to clinical supervision than it does to a proactive approach to staff development. Performance evaluation is retrospective; instructional leadership is prospective and "... is focused on what can be, not what was (p. 433)." An effective instructional leader provides opportunities for teachers to continue their professional development both on and off the school site, with the goal of developing within each teacher the qualities which will enhance student learning.

Monitoring Student Progress

"... although the marketplace provides the final test, principals provide a first-level quality control check on the preparation of students (p. 433)." An effective instructional leader is familiar with a variety of ways in which student progress can be assessed and required that these assessments be done on a regular basis. The principal should be able to clarify the meaning of outcomes when necessary. He/she can competently review the results and use them to assist teachers, students, and parents in developing strategies for improving performance. The principal, of course, cannot interpret every assessment given in a school building, but he/she should make it clear that testing, interpretation, and productive response are expected and that the process will be monitored.

Promoting Instructional Climate

"When the atmosphere of the school is one that values learning and supports achievements, it is difficult not to learn (Krug, 1993, p. 241)." The principal is responsible for

creating an atmosphere of educational excitement at all levels and for channeling the energies of students and teachers in productive ways (Krug, 1993). The instructional climate of the school can be promoted in a variety of ways, including the provision of a safe and structured environment, child-centered activities, and a pervasive understanding that a premium is placed on doing one's personal best. All shareholders have great expectations for the students.

Even though a large body of research on instructional leadership supports the fundamental elements described above, "... instructional leadership remains one of the more controversial characteristics associated with effective schools and effective school districts (Lezotte, 1994, p. 20)." There are still very few principals who are described as instructional leaders (Lezotte, 1994). The reasons for this are multiple and include a resistance to change in the form of school reform, a reluctance to subscribe to the commitment of "learning for all" as opposed to "learning for many," a tendency by the powers that be to hire administrators who, like themselves, use traditional organizational management techniques (Lezotte), and the difficulty inherent in implementing all of the tasks associated with the principalship, both management and leadership. Rallis and Highsmith in a text by Jacobson and Conway (1995) questioned whether or not any one person can be an equally effective manager and instructional leader. The principal, already spread thin with the demands of the 1990s, now has an additional role dimension (Jacobson and Conway, 1995).

As we approach the 21st century, America's public schools are under siege from all sides: Our rapidly changing nation is forcing a reevaluation of all we hold dear. The complicated dynamics of change require that we proactively and innovatively address and meet the needs of the next generation of citizens. This will require leadership in a myriad of forms.

Though the forms may be myriad and the leadership dispersed, Bennis (1994) believes that for three reasons we never-the-less need leaders: (1) someone (at the "top") must be responsible for the effectiveness of the organization, (2) change and upheaval require some kind of anchor, and (3) a pervasive national concern about the integrity of our institutions requires that we have competent, honest people in positions of leadership.

II. The Components of Instructional Leadership

While Krug has described five domains that must be engaged in by the effective instructional leader, Teresa Northern and Gerald Bailey (1991) have identified seven professional competencies that are apparent in instructional leaders:

1. Visionary Leadership - "Only a clear vision of the future and a flexible blueprint for arriving at that vision will equip instructional leaders adequately (p. 25)."
2. Strategic Planning - This is a proactive mode based on the administrator's understanding of the dynamics of the organization. "An effective, excellent administrator will always have a good feel for the organizational pulse and temperature of (individuals and groups) (p. 25)."
3. Change Agency - The effective leader must understand change and be able to implement it with minimal disruption. It is helpful for principals to know Fullan's (1982) stages of change and to also be aware of the leaders and blockers in the process so that roles can be "properly assigned for successful adoption, implementation, and institutionalization (p. 26)."
4. Communication - "Principals as instructional leaders must be master communicators (p. 26)." They must be able to communicate their expectations

with clarity and meaning. "Administrative presentation must be varied to accommodate the individual styles and unique experiences of all listeners (p. 26)."

5. Role Modeling - Instructional leaders must model their expectations in all settings of the learning environment. The vision and the strategies for achieving them must be manifested in the behavior of the principal. This includes modeling a variety of teaching styles in forums such as staff meetings and development sessions so as to demonstrate to teachers an awareness of the needs of listeners.

6. Nurturing - The principal must foster a positive school climate where failure is safe and reflection is encourages. This he/she must do for the teachers and they, in turn, must provide the same for students. The spirit should be team oriented and cooperative both at the building level and in the classroom. The instructional leader should be sensitive to the needs of all shareholders, with an ability to not only see but act on other viewpoints. The nurturing principal is also sensitive to the history of the organization, knowing when to maintain the traditional and when to introduce the new.

7. Disturbing - "Leaders of tomorrow must find ways to disturb those who are comfortable with the status quo (p. 27)." Complacency will be the kiss of death in schools of the 21st century. Change is inevitable. Growth will be a requirement.

These competencies are above and beyond the more recently expected role of the principal as manager of the organization. Jacobson and Conway (1995) "... see the position of the building level administrator as one of the most critical, demanding, challenging, stressful,

and time-consuming in the educational profession (p. 131)." The demands become even more complex when contextual variables that impact on the process of school leadership are taken into account. Personal, organizational, social, and environmental factors that influence the dynamics and decision making in the organization play an important part in the situational leadership/management that takes place in the school (Greenfield, 1987).

Two other factors which influence the principal's ability to effectively lead in the instructional realm are the clarity and complexity of the instructional technology (Greenfield). Clarity refers to the extent to which the instructional process is understood and can be specified and complexity is the "... degree to which the instructional processes of the school require interdependence and coordination among the teaching staff (p. 183)." Schools vary in the clarity of the instructional process to which they are committed. Where greater clarity exists, closer supervision is possible because all players are using the same game plan. More valid assessments of classroom instruction can be made and positive outcomes are more likely. Schools whose complexity of instruction is high require increased coordination of efforts by the principal, requiring the principal to become more actively involved in all components of the instructional process, including the development of curriculum.

In closing, it is important to emphasize that because of the variations that exist in schools across our nation, the requirements of instructional leaders also vary. Situational leadership, based on the needs of the site forms the agenda. There is no foolproof prescription for implementing effective instructional leadership.

III. Implementing Instructional Leadership in the School

"Teachers work effectively together when they understand and appreciate the mission of education - the development of civilized people (Tyler, 1989, p. 38)." The development of civilized people requires an instructional program that is broad based and effective. The success of the instructional program is dependent upon all who engage in the process, but the ultimate responsibility lies with the principal. Teachers work more effectively together when morale is high and when students sense that their teachers care about them and have high expectations for them (Tyler). And again, the responsibility for this atmosphere is believed to lie with the principal (Tyler).

"Perceived purpose is at the heart of a school's life, work, and ultimate effectiveness. It is that on which we must concentrate in attempting to enhance the learning and growth of students (Maehr & Parker, 1993, p. 235)." This observation supports Krug's (1992) contention that the first step in effective instructional leadership is to define the mission of the school and to communicate it effectively to the staff, students, parents, and community. Ideally, everybody must commit to the mission. According to Tyler, "The principal is leading a team dedicated to improving the learning of the students in the school (1989, p. 39)."

> "The notion of the principal who acts as the all-knowing patriarch of the school and who wisely solves all problems is passe. Principals must be team builders. Today, success requires the knowledge of all the professionals in the building and all the community resources outside the building. The smart administrator knows that to tap into that collective wisdom, a team must be forged (Clark, 1995, p. 9)."

Susan Clark (1995) contends that team building cannot be done overnight, but requires careful planning "... training, practice, and thought (p. 9)." This training, practice, and reflection includes both development in instructional methods and curriculum and in working together productively (Clark).

Elaine Stephens suggests a four-step strategy for implementing staff development successfully. She believes that much staff development "... easily degenerates into a 'fad of the month' or a form of entertainment that bears no relation to school needs and goals (1990, p. 25)." In order to avoid meaningless staff development sessions she recommends the "four Cs" of staff development:

"Commitment - This refers to a commitment on the part of principals to provide meaningful and timely in-service training for their staffs. Principals should stay abreast of current issues and trends themselves, and should be vocal proponents for continued professional growth. The principal who is committed to staff development is also willing to actively seek funding to support these efforts.

Collaboration - "Successful principals realize that you cannot simply mandate new ideas and techniques. You must convince teachers that in-service training is valuable (p.25)." One of the best ways to do this is to actively involve teachers in planning the in-service training programs. Also, the principal should make his/her presence known, engaging teachers in conversation, listening actively, and building a camaraderie that results in collegiality and trust.

Communication - Stephens agrees with Northern and Bailey (1991) that effective and productive communication is a must. Failure to communicate with the staff, parents, and community "closes the door to new ideas (p. 25)."

Coordination - "Every in-service program should be planned with the needs of teachers and the school in mind, and identifying these needs and finding the right speakers means working closely with your staff (p. 25)." In other words, the staff development programs must have content that will meet help the participants meet the goals stated in the mission of the school. "If teachers find little of interest or value in the training session, the fault might lie with the instructional leader of the school: the principal (p. 24)."

Stephen says,

"Staff development is at the heart of school improvement - and it has far-reaching implications for the professional development of teachers and the success of academic reforms. Indeed, where staff development efforts are inadequate, any endeavor to improve the school program is seriously threatened (p. 24)."

Teachers implement instruction in the classroom, and as soldiers on the front lines, what is expected of them must be made perfectly clear by the principal. In order to be at their professional best, they must receive additional training. While some teachers are self-starting, life-long learners, others are not, and the principal must provide staff development opportunities to ensure that all of the educators are prepared.

Staff development is particularly important today because of the increase in site-based management and shared decision making. School leadership is now extended to teachers and

parents. "Decisions that were previously made alone or with staff in an advisory capacity now require extensive consultation with various stakeholders (Hallinger, 1992, p. 42)." Responsible decision making requires background knowledge that can be partially provided by staff development.

Another important consideration for the principal to make when planning for instructional leadership is whether or not his/her building program will reflect "task" goals or "ability" goals (Maehr & Parker, 1993). "A task goal stresses the importance of learning for the sake of learning... (p. 236)." Whether or not a student is successful is determined by individual improvement or progress rather than by how one performs in comparison to others. Learning is valuable in its own right. Ability goals are competitive in nature and their outcomes "... demonstrate that one is more able, competent, and intelligent than others (p. 236)." Learning is considered a means to a particular end. While the two approaches can exist in the same school, one will most generally prevail and the result "... has important consequences for behavior generally and for motivation and learning in particular (p. 236)."

> "When a school adopts a task focus, students tend to feel good about what they are doing, showing a continuing interest in learning even after the formal instruction is completed. They are more likely to exhibit "academic venturesomeness... (p. 236)." In addition, "Errors are regarded as part of the learning process, as a means of acquiring information. In contrast, students in schools that adopt an ability focus not only tend to have a less positive attitude toward learning, but they also approach it very differently. Given an ability focus, students are less likely to think about the meaning of what they

are doing and more likely to determine the quickest and easiest way to get the job done (p. 236)."

There is debate about whether or not a school can really be successful by eliminating competition and focusing on task goals. In addition, critical learnings are exactly that, critical. There is a knowledge base that students must leave the public schools with. It would seem, like so many other issues, that the solution would be an integration of the two orientations, with an emphasis on the importance on the process of learning for meaning and application. The two need not be mutually exclusive. The important thing is that the principal, as instructional leader, be aware of the tension that exists between task and ability goals, be able to recognize them in his/her building, and manage the focus on one or another to the benefit of students.

The results of the Self-Assessment Study conducted by Andrews at the University of Washington on the "Dimensions of Instructional leadership of Principals" included the identification of three factors related to the principalship and rated to be the most important by the teachers surveyed. These factors were: (a) the visibility of the principal in the building, (b) the principal's vision for the school, and (c) the ability of the principal to make resources available so that teachers could provide quality instruction. Andrews, Basom, and Basom would support these findings, for they state,

"To create a visible presence in day-to-day activities, principals must model behaviors consistent with the school's vision; live and breathe their beliefs in education; organize resources to accomplish building and district goals; informally drop in on classrooms; make staff development activities a priority; and most of all, help people do the right things and reinforce those activities (1991, p. 100)."

Jack McCurdy, citing Daniel Duke (1983) says that the effective principal implements instructional leadership by concentrating on six areas: people (by developing an effective, highly motivated staff), instructional support, provision of adequate resources, quality control (in the form of supervision, education, rewards, sanctions, and close monitoring of student progress), coordination of activities in the school, and problem solving. Most of all, Duke believes that the principal's insistence on good teaching forms the basis for strong instructional leadership. He says,

> "In no other area is the principal's influence felt more than in his insistence that every teacher be well prepared every day with interesting, challenging lessons and activities. The principal should be in classrooms observing teachers, offering support and suggestions. He/she should have an ongoing in-service program for improvement of the instruction in the school. This advocacy of good teaching may be the most important single influence the principal can have in providing students with a school that is a comfortable, exciting, stimulating learning place (p. 24)."

In closing, it is important to remember that although the buck for instructional leadership stops at the principal's doorstep, the efforts should truly be team-driven. Indeed, if the principal is a facilitator of instruction, rather than the "leader," then it would be safe to assume that the true instructional leaders in the school could be the teachers themselves! As Hallinger states,

> "The instructional leadership imagery of the 1980s highlighted the centrality of the principal's role in coordinating and controlling curriculum and instruction. In contrast, advocates of school restructuring emphasize the diffuse nature of school leadership. As Sergiovanni has noted, the term 'instructional leader' suggests that others have got to be

followers. The legitimate instructional leaders, if we have to have them, ought to be teachers (1992, p. 41)." The principal serves as the headteacher.

IV. Instructional Leadership and the Central Office

The school district's central office can and should play a role in the promotion of instructional leadership. Robert Wimpelberg, in a text by Greenfield (1987) contends that the potential power of the central office in the instructional leadership discussion is often overlooked. He believes that "... instructional leadership can take the shape of a pattern of process-expectations coupled with firmly directive actions (from the C.O.) that make instructional improvement a reality, without making any particular template fit all classrooms and schools (p.106)." This allows for site-based leadership designed to flex according to contextual variables.

Too often the central office serves as the generator not of instructional leadership, but of organizational management tasks. Referring to the application of behavioral sciences to organizational management during the 1950s and 1960s, John Goodlad says, "We corrupted the educational process through over-cultivation of schooling as a management system rather than a collection of loosely coordinated human systems called schools (1994, p. 96)." Because of the mountainous collection of bureaucratic tasks that must be undertaken, "(We have lost) the essence of education - teaching and learning - that should be at the center. (It) has been replaced for many by a whirling carnival of activity that is far from satisfying (pp. 96-97)."

Wimpelberg sets forth five propositions intended to engage the central office in the instructional process. They are:

Proposition 1 - Instruction in most schools is not likely to improve unless a leadership consciousness at the district level develops in such a way as to forge linkages between schools and central office, among schools, and among teachers within schools.

Proposition 2 - The best linkages are forged, not through centralized instructional prescriptions but through an exchange process in which the central office and school administrators simultaneously challenge and support each other.

Proposition 3 - The central office personnel with the highest potential for exercising instructional leadership are intermediate administrators who have the organization authority to supervise and evaluate principals and the expert and referent authority to support them.

Proposition 4 - The primary responsibility of the intermediate administrator is to see that every school principal develops both a technical and cultural consciousness of the school.

Proposition 5 - The instructional leadership role of the central office administrator requires a new kind of intimacy with schools (pp. 106-111)."

Goodlad (1994) thinks that the superintendent must play an active role in instructional leadership by increasing the amount of discretionary time he/she has to devote to the individual schools.

"The way to do this is to delegate almost everything - budget, research, public relations, and yes, even curriculum and instruction - to his/her administrative team. In so delegating, the superintendent does not get rid of the responsibility for the educational

program. He/she merely rids themself of demanding details so as to have more time to think and plan and lead (p. 98)."

If the staffs at the school sites know that the superintendent has a vested interest in the success of the individual schools and high expectations for those who implement the process, motivation to succeed should increase. The superintendent should relate to the schools as the principal is expected to relate to his/her constituents.

Wimpelberg, citing Cuban, states that one of the most important things a superintendent can do is "take the time to acknowledge and honor academic excellence (p. 109)." Over time, it seems that many schools, in the interest of protecting the self-esteem of slow learners or as a result of focusing on athletics or social/values programs, have not paid enough attention to honoring those who have demonstrated academic achievement. Only when we place our emphasis on learning and success in the classroom (rather than on bureaucratic tasks and extracurricular concerns) will instructional improvement ever be taken seriously. Congruently, it is now becoming more acceptable to equate self-esteem with real success, not manufactured success.

In summation, leadership, by virtue of its meaning, should emanate from the top, embracing and encouraging all those who participate at the lower levels. Therefore, it is imperative that instructional leadership be modeled not just by the building principal but also by his/her superiors in the central office.

V. Instructional Leadership and Student Achievement

"The impact of good leadership within the school is reflected in the achievement of students (Krug, 1993, p. 243)." In a study Krug did with several colleagues designed to measure leadership effectiveness, he found that the

> "... relationship between leadership and student achievement was consistently positive at (grades 3, 6, and 8). That is, as leadership scores rose, student achievement scores rose; as leadership scores fell, student achievement scores fell. Across curriculum areas and grades, student learning outcomes correlated most highly with principals' skillful supervision of teachers, followed closely by principal's ability to define and communicate a mission (p. 243)."

Heck (1992) found that, "The link between principal behavior and school outcomes is at best indirect (p. 22)." His reservations are due to the complexity of the variables that effect school outcomes and the weaknesses in the research on instructional leadership and effective schools. While his reservations are worthy of note, most writers on the subject, like Krug, seem convinced that despite the complexities of the organization, the people who drive it, and the environment in which it operates, instructional leadership by the principal does have a significant impact on outcomes.

Terry Foriska (1994) implemented a diagnostic program with teachers that proved to enhance student achievement in the classroom. Teachers used diagnostic data on students' cognitive abilities and collaboration techniques to design strategies for better meeting the learning needs of their students. "The teachers reported that the cognitive skills data helped direct them as they planned lessons [They had previously been determining student needs based on intuition.]

(p.33)." By analyzing diagnostic data, teachers were not only able to design appropriate strategies, but also "... allowed [them] to form more responsible expectations for student achievement (p. 35)." These efforts resulted in an ability to modify instructional designs, which resulted in less student frustration and greater student academic success (p. 33)." This example of Foriska's intentional instructional leadership is a good example of school improvement effort on the part of an administrator.

According to research done by Steven Bossert (McCurdy, 1989):

"principals in high achieving schools tend to:

- emphasize achievement by setting instructional goals, developing performance standards for students, and expressing optimism about the ability of students to meet instructional goals,
- devote more time to coordination and control of instruction,
- have more skill in instructional matters, observe teachers' work more, discuss work with teachers more often, and engage in more in-service and evaluation activities with teachers,
- project more power than other principals, especially in decision making involving curriculum and instruction,
- have influence in the mobilization of district support and involvement in the school's instructional plans,
- foster structured learning environments with few disciplinary problems and buffer classrooms from interruptions by stressing discipline and relieving teachers of paperwork, and

- know community power structures and maintain appropriate relations with parents (p. 25)."

VI. Transformational Leadership for the Turn of the Century

The seeming dichotomy between organizational management and leadership agendas need not present a barrier to school success. In the opinion of J. P. Kotter, as expressed in Carlson's Reframing and Reform: Perspectives on Organization, Leadership, and School Change (1996),

> "... any combination other than strong management and strong leadership has the potential for producing unsatisfactory results. When both are weak or nonexistent, it is like a rudderless ship with a hole in the hull. But adding just one of the two does not necessarily make the situation much better. Strong management without much leadership can turn bureaucratic and stifling, producing order for order's sake. Strong leadership without much management can become messianic and cult-like, producing change for change's sake - even if the movement is in a totally insane direction (pp. 136-137)."

Our pluralistic, rapidly changing nation is demanding that the public schools rise to the occasion and meet the needs of the 21st century by operating on the cutting edge of reform. Our schools need leaders who can first "reframe" the scenarios in which they function and then reform and restructure. Quoting Conger, Carlson (1996) defines frames as "... symbolic structures that we use to make sense of our personal and social experiences - the perspective(s) from which we interpret experience - the perspective(s) from which we interpret experience (p. 141)." In the words of Bolman and Deal, "Too often they [managers and leaders] bring too few ideas to the challenges that they face. They live in psychic prisons because they cannot look at

old problems in a new light and attack old challenges with different and more powerful tools - they cannot 'reframe' (p. 12-13)."

The transformational leader's task is to transform the principalship and the school itself by successfully integrating both the management and the instructional leadership domains. This is not a job for the weak spirited. It will require a leader with a certain degree of charisma as manifested in "... a high level of self-confidence, a tendency to dominate, a need to influence others, and a strong conviction in the integrity of one's own beliefs (Carlson, 1996, p. 139)." It would seem that the principalship will become even more demanding! Is it possible for one person to be all things? In any case, those persons in the principalship and those who are preparing to enter it, must be aware of the high, if not unreasonable, expectations that the publics have of their educational leaders.

Carlson proposes Flood's and Jackson's Total Systems Intervention process as a valid approach to transformational leadership (1996). TSI is not a "quick fix" or prescription for problem solving. It is a process that allows for flexibility depending on the scenario of the problem. Carlson considers the TSI approach valid for three reasons: (1) it allows leaders to reframe situations with the use of metaphors and allows recognition of subjectivity in organizational management, (2) it grows out of and like up to current theories and research on leadership and organizations, and (3) it encourages creativity and adaption of leadership strategies to situational events and environments (1996).

While transformational leadership sounds noble, it is never-the-less idealistic. The daily demands made on administrators, can interrupt and disrupt the best of intentions. Perhaps there

is another way: reorganization of the educational hierarchy and redistribution of responsibilities. These thoughts will be explained in the conclusion.

VII. Conclusion

Donal Sacken (1994), referring to the NPBEA document Principals of our Changing Schools: Knowledge and Skill Base, says that there are twenty-one different domains of knowledge which the successful principal must master in order to be truly effective. Saken finds the likelihood of anyone being able to meet these expectations nearly impossible, and likens the search for such an individual to Ponce de Leon's futile search for the Fountain of Youth. Therefore, if the expectations for those who fill the principalship cannot be met by mere mortals, then perhaps we should rethink the way schools are managed and led and consider other configurations that would eliminate the need for "water walkers." In the current mode of school restructuring, with the emphasis on shared decision making, this would seem a reasonable suggestion.

All persons serving in the field of education have areas in which they excel or prefer to work. Although, "... principals must integrate a variety of role orientations if they are to succeed as school leaders (Hallinger, 1992, p. 44)." However, there is a tendency, described by Cuban as the "DNA" of the principalship, that seems to predispose the administrator to either the management or instructional leader track (Hallinger, 1992). This may indeed be a function of "DNA" predisposition, but it might also be a manifestation of the context in which the principal administrates. One or the other role might be more appropriate or more necessary. In any event, should we not capitalize on the strengths of all shareholders by redistributing responsibilities, so that no one person is expected to be all things to all people?

Could we restructure so that the principalship is one that reflects management strategies only? Instructional and curricular concerns would be directed by a district instructional/curriculum director who would work closely with designated lead teachers in each building. These lead teachers would be men and women with a demonstrated mastery of instructional techniques, classroom management, and leadership skills. The lead teachers would be considered middle management and compensated accordingly for the extra responsibilities they take on. It might even be wise to consider having two instructional/curriculum directors, one for the middle and high schools and one for the elementary program. The principal, instructional/curriculum director, and the lead teachers would work together as a team to deliver staff development opportunities in both group and individual settings.

This format would establish more of a hierarchy in the school setting, but isn't that a more realistic representation of the dynamics outside the public school? In addition, this division of labor and the recognition of master teachers is long overdue. We can channel expert teachers in such a way that their wisdom and experience can be a benefit to all, and at the same time allow the principal to focus on management. While administrators are often encouraged to delegate tasks, the principal often has no one to delegate his/her myriad of tasks to! This plan would at least help in the instructional leadership realm.

People may have a clearer picture of what the job description of the principalship is and therefore be able to make choices about where they "fit in" in the educational puzzle. For example, a person whose "DNA" is instructionally oriented may choose to be a lead teacher rather than a principal, provided the monetary compensation is satisfactory. Another, whose

"DNA" is management, may go for the principalship. A high achiever who is interested in instruction might opt for the instructional/curriculum directorship.

It is possible that some school districts are already utilizing a plan such as this. Others, because of labor contract restrictions would probably resist it. We must be willing to restructure our public schools to more accurately represent the real world of work.

Regardless of what capacity the principal serves in, Bennis, quoting John W. Gardner from No Easy Victories writes,

> "Leaders have a significant role in creating the state of mind that is society. They can serve as symbols of the moral unity of the society. They can express the values that hold the society together. Most important, they can conceive and articulate goals that lift people out of their petty preoccupations, carry them above the conflicts that tear a society apart, and unite them in pursuit of objectives worthy of their best efforts (1994, p. 13)."

The school and the school community is the society in which the principalship operates. The principal must rise to the occasion and strive to meet the needs and demands of that society.

REFERENCES

Andrews, R. L., Basom, M. R., & Basom, M. (1991). Instructional leadership: Supervision that makes a difference. Theory Into Practice, 30 (2), 97-101.

Bennis, Warren (1994). On Becoming a Leader (2nd ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley.

Carlson, Robert V. (1996). Reframing and Reform: Perspectives on Organization, Leadership, and School Change. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Clark, Susan (1995). What leadership skills do principals really need? The School Administrator 52 (5), 8-11.

Foriska, Terry J. (1994). The principal as instructional leader: Teaming with teachers for student success. Schools in the Middle 3 (3), 31-34.

Goodlad, John I. (1994). What Schools are For (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Greenfield, William (1987). Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues, and Controversies. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hallinger, Philip (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leaders. Journals of Educational Administration 30 (3), 35-48.

Heck, Ronald H. (1992). Principals' instructional leadership and school performance: Implications for policy development. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 14 (1), 21-34.

Jacobson, Stephen L. & Conway, James A. (1990). Educational Leadership in an Age of Reform. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Krug, Samuel (1992). Instructional leadership: A constructivist perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly 28 (3), 430-443.

Krug, Samuel (1993). Leadership craft and the crafting of school leaders. Phi Delta Kappan 75 (3), 240-244.

Lezotte, Lawrence (1994). The nexus of instructional leadership and effective schools. The School Administrator 51 (6), 20-23.

Maehr, M. L., & Parker, S. A. (1993). A tale of two schools - and The primary task of leadership. Phi Delta Kappan 75 (3), 233-236.

McCurdy, Jack (1983). The Role of the Principal in Effective Schools: Problems and Solutions. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Northern, T. K., & Bailey, G. D., (1991). Instructional leaders for the 21st century: Seven critical characteristics. Educational Considerations 18 (2), 25-28.

Sacken, Donal (1994). No more principals! Phi Delta Kappan 75 (9), 664-670.

Stephens, Elaine (1990). Make staff development the heart of school improvement. The Executive Educator 12 (11), 24-25.

Tyler, Ralph W. (1989). The role of the principal in promoting student learning. Educational Planning 7 (1), 38-42.